



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

lately in Indiana itself. The position which the Supreme Court has taken is uncertain. Justice Field in *Warnock v. Davis*, 104 U. S. 775, endorses the Indiana doctrine, and in *N. Y. Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Armstrong*, 117 U. S. 591, 597, he apparently holds the same view.

TRADE—UNFAIR COMPETITION—USE OF SIMILAR SURNAME.—*VAN HOUTEN v. HOOTON COCOA & CHOCOLATE CO.*, 130 FED. 600.—Defendant, a corporation named after its founder Hooton, in good faith manufactured and sold "Hooton's Cocoa" by use of which name confusion in trade resulted to the damage of complainants, makers of the well known "Van Houten's Cocoa." *Held*, that such liability to confusion and deception was ground for granting an injunction against the defendants' use of said name unless accompanied by a clear statement distinguishing its cocoa from complainants'.

The basis for relief in unfair competition is fraud. *Gorham Mfg. Co. v. Dry Goods Co.*, 104 Fed. 243; *Day v. Webster*, 49 N. Y. Supp. 314. The use in good faith of one's name in connection with an article offered for sale is generally held justifiable and damage resulting to another from similarity of surnames is *damnum absque injuria*. *Brown Chemical Co. v. Meyer*, 139 U. S. 540; *Nat'l Starch Mfg. Co. v. Duryea*, 101 Fed. 117; *Harson v. Hall-yard*, 22 R. I. 102; *Hazelton Boiler Co. v. Hazelton Tripod Boiler Co.*, 142 Ill. 494.

USURY—PROMISSORY NOTE—*LEX LOCI CONTRACTUS*.—*WHITLOCK v. COHN ET AL.*, 80 S. W. 141, (ARK.).—*Held*, that the place of payment of a promissory note will not be regarded as determining the place of the making of the contract so as to render the contract usurious, since the parties will not be presumed to have contracted with reference to a law which will make the contract illegal.

It is now well settled that where the place of the making of the contract and the place of performance are the same, its validity as regards usury is determined by the law of that jurisdiction and not by the law of the place where the suit is brought. *Merchants' Bank v. Griswold*, 72 N. Y. 472; *Philadelphia Loan Co. v. Towner*, 13 Conn. 249. But when the contract is made in one state and payment is to be made in another, there is much conflict among the authorities. In some jurisdictions it is held without reserve that the law of the place of performance must govern. *Bennett v. Eastern Building & Loan Association*, 177 Pa. St. 233; *People's Building & Loan Association v. Tinsley*, 96 Va. 322. In Massachusetts the rule is that the law of the place of execution and payment of the consideration will control. *Akens v. Demond*, 103 Mass. 318; *Glidden v. Chamberlin*, 167 Mass. 486. In the Federal courts and in many of the state courts, it is held, as in the present case, that the intention of the parties is the controlling factor. *Miller v. Tiffany*, 1 Wall. 298; *Wayne Co. Savings Bank v. Lowe*, 81 N. Y. 566; *Pancoast v. Travellers Ins. Co.*, 79 Ind. 172.